

Section 18: Spatiality and the Transliminal Being

18.1. The Necessity of Spatial Dimensions

A three-dimensional cube must indeed be three-dimensional; otherwise, it is not a cube. Three-dimensional figures are expressed by occupying space in three independent directions: length, width, and height. Without this spatial occupation, the phenomenon cannot be expressed as three-dimensional.

18.2. Exploring the Foundations of Spatiality

What allows length, width, and height to be expressed is spatial extension in vertical and horizontal directions. What enables vertical and horizontal directions is extension in space. What makes extension possible is spatiality. But what underlies spatiality itself? To attempt to define space, we need to find an entry point.

18.3. Defining Space Through Perception

When we think of space using the image of a three-dimensional cube, we interpret space in terms of distance. We often perceive the lack of definition as a definition itself. The visible definition of a thing is its visible appearance. In common vernacular, we call "space" the distance between the surfaces of an entity or phenomenon and other entities or phenomena. But that cannot be space, because defining space in this way leaves the definition incomplete.

18.4. Form and Extended Delineation

A phenomenon has its essential definition, which confines it to itself, preventing it from being any other phenomenon, and without which it cannot be expressed. Every phenomenon has an essential definition regarding its form. Form is given by extended delineation. But what is extended delineation?

A line is an extended delineation. Consider the simple representation:

/

The extremities of a line are points, constituting its initial and terminal points. Now, consider the following two lines, Line A and Line B:

Line A: /

Line B: /

18.5. The Space Between Lines

The "space" between Line A and Line B is defined by not being either line but by being a kind of opening that allows other phenomena to appear without becoming central to the situation. While observing these two lines, we do not necessarily focus on the screen interface, the screen itself, or the app layout as constituting "space." Instead, these elements are interpreted as a de-centered background; they happen to have a presence within the context of the lines but do not signify what draws our attention to "space."

Thus, space is interpreted as a kind of invisibility that both is and is not the full schematic background of de-centered, out-of-focus phenomena.

18.6. Space as Relational Centering and Decentering

When we speak of "space," our concern is not with the kind of substance peculiar to physics nor with the cognitive form of possibility peculiar to philosophy. Instead, when we consider "space," we are centering focused phenomena in particular relational patterns with one another, within a situation where de-centered phenomena also participate. These de-centered phenomena may be taken out of their staggered, de-centered positions and brought into focus.

Therefore, space is not the signification of a substance or form. Rather, it is the array of relations stratified by the centeredness and de-centeredness of phenomena, all within a contextual region.

18.7. Space as Experience of Focus

"Space" is thus a characteristic in the experience of what is in-focus and what is out-of-focus. What we call in-focus is that which is brought forth, emerging out of space and delimited by it, surrounded by space. What we call out-of-focus is suspended in space—it is the manifold of phenomena that delineates the in-focus phenomena and entities brought out of the region called "space."

18.8. Quantities and Mathematical Engagement

Quantities, then, are a kind of region that allows for engagement in relationships between phenomena or entities—the kind of engagement we call mathematics. Quantities provide the framework within which we can relate and measure phenomena, highlighting the relational aspect of spatiality.

18.9. The Vacuum and Emptiness of Space

What, then, is the "vacuum" that space articulates?

This notion is a theoretical stance on space.

It involves the spatializing of space, where the phenomena of space become stratified through the centering and de-centering processes.

The aspect of "emptiness" is brought forward and made central in its context.

The idea of a vacuum emphasizes the perceived emptiness within space, yet this emptiness is filled with the relational dynamics of phenomena being centered and

de-centered. Space, therefore, is not merely an empty container but a dynamic field of relational engagement.

18.10. Spatiality and the Transliminal Being

In the context of the Transliminal Ontologic, spatiality becomes another dimension through which the transliminal being engages with phenomena. Just as temporality provides the framework for the being-with-in-and-as of the transliminal being, spatiality offers a relational structure of centeredness and de-centeredness. The transliminal being navigates this spatiality by bringing phenomena into focus, engaging with them, and allowing others to recede into the background.

This understanding of spatiality complements our previous discussions on temporality and engagement, highlighting the multidimensional nature of the transliminal being's existence.

Section 19. Clarifying Remarks.

19.1. Articulating the Nuanced Insight into Temporality

I feel that my insight may be too nuanced, and I'm not articulating it properly.

It might seem almost obvious to say, "Time is both static and dynamic." Yes, we commonly refer to the past, present, and future, so the central point of temporal non-linearity might appear moot.

But that's not what I'm saying. What is radical here is the full acceptance that temporality has presence (not merely a present moment) and is indeed relational (not just segmented into past, present, future). Time is also elastic (beyond memory and prediction) and, moreover, it is ecstatic (not just phase states of memory

recounted and predictions presented in the present). Time is indeed different *here* than it is *there* (not simply a dichotomy of Brahman against Maya). Finally, it's true that time depends upon how the world as the phenomenal self is engaged by the ownmost personal self—the experiencer (not a distinct subject perceiving an objective world).

Consider how it's possible for one person to experience an event as having a certain duration and another person to perceive it differently, as expressed in everyday thoughts like:

"I'm so bored; this is taking forever."

"Oh really? I'm having a blast; feels like it's been two minutes."

This illustrates how perception is based on how the self engages with itself—as the self as the world and the self as the "I"/ego.

19.2. The Paradoxical Nature of Temporality

"How can time be both unchanging and ever-changing, both present and relational, both static and ecstatic? This seemingly paradoxical nature of temporality lies at the heart of the transliminal being.

Upon reflecting on this, another insight emerges.

19.3. The Experiential Basis as Evidence

To further refine this insight, I pose the following question:

Does the experiential basis of this paradox serve as evidence to justify my exceedingly abstract framework of the being of the human as both the *experiencer*

(traditionally, "I" and "ego") and simultaneously the *non-self phenomena* and *world experienced* (traditionally, "things," "objects," "other")?

Is it clear that when I say the being of the human is both the experiencer and the experienced through what I call "belonging" and "alienation," and that this interplay constitutes change?

19.4. Clarifying "Alienation"

To avoid confusion about what I mean by "alienation," let me clarify that I do not refer to *feelings* of alienation.

When I use this term in this context, I mean that I, as the human being in first-person experiential engagement, never perceive myself as, for example, my car, the interior of my car, the seat, or the steering wheel. There is an incredibly vast, open-ended aspect to the being of the transliminal being that never grasps itself as being what it engages with and experiences.

This extends even into our own selves when we treat our thoughts as not defining who we are. We might say:

"I am not defined by my thinking. What I think arises of its own accord, and I am in control to decide what I feel is correct and question those thoughts which present themselves questionably and unstably, perhaps even dangerously to my well-being."

Similarly, we might treat parts of our body as not who we are, saying things like:

"I can still live without my leg."

Meaning that what we are is not the organic matter we call our own body, without which we could not even call a body our own.

When I say "alienate," I refer to the special and peculiar way in which the transliminal being treats an entire "world" as completely different and altogether not itself—distinct and apart from itself.

19.5. The Circles of Focus: Centering and Decentering

What I have concluded is that, in fact, the world and the phenomena within it, and which constitute it, are arranged according to circles of focus, or what I call centering and decentering.

To understand what I mean by these circles of focus, consider the following:

The Phenomenological Analysis of Circles of Focus

In exploring the concept of the circles of focus, we aim to understand how the self perceives and engages with the world and phenomena. This analysis elucidates how the transliminal being (the human being) navigates the intricate relationship between the self as the experiencer and the world as the experienced.

Existence and Reality

We begin by acknowledging that individuals exist and possess a unique personal way of being specific to themselves. Their reality is affirmed through their disclosure of existence, manifested not only in their actions and words but also in the roles they occupy and the artifacts associated with them. For instance, a person expresses their existence through:

The attire they choose, such as pink, soft shirts.

The various roles they inhabit—clerk, grandmother, mother, babysitter.

Their actions within specific temporal and spatial coordinates, such as driving from point A to point B between 3 p.m. and 3:15 p.m.

These expressions constitute the ways in which individuals disclose themselves to others, revealing the phenomena of their existence.

Consciousness and the Limits of Experience

While we can attest to the reality of another's existence through observable phenomena, we cannot directly experience their consciousness. The first-person experiential aspect of their being remains inaccessible to us, just as our own consciousness is inaccessible to others. This highlights a fundamental alienation inherent in human experience—we perceive others as "other than me," distinct from our own self-awareness.

By reflecting on this, we recognize that although we can observe and interact with the manifestations of another's existence, we cannot fully comprehend their subjective experience. This underscores the distinction between the ownmost self (the first-person experiencer) and the phenomenal world (the realm of observable phenomena).

Conditionality and the Flame Analogy

In our conscious experience, we find that every existing thing is conditioned and conditional. To illustrate this, consider a flame:

The flame exists within a specific context: inside a casing, within four walls, on a street, in a city, on a planet, within a galaxy, and so on.

Each layer of context represents a circle of focus, expanding or contracting our attention.

By meditatively negating these conditionalities—stripping away the contexts—we are left with the flame's pure flaming: its essence. However, even this essence is dependent on the conditions that allow it to exist. Thus, the flame's existence is both independent in its flaming and dependent on the myriad conditions that make it possible.

Interplay of Self and World

This analysis reveals that the self, in observing the flame, engages in a process of centering and decentering—shifting focus between the flame's existence and the conditions surrounding it. The circles of focus represent this dynamic engagement, illustrating how the self navigates the relationship between immediate experience and broader contexts.

Moreover, this process reflects the paradoxical nature of the self's relation to the world:

The self recognizes that while it is distinct from the phenomena it observes (alienation), it is also intrinsically connected to them through the conditions that make both the self and the phenomena possible (belonging).

The flame becomes a symbol of this interconnectedness, highlighting that the self and the world are intertwined through the shared ground of Being.

Existential Implications

By acknowledging that we cannot directly experience another's consciousness, yet we observe their existence through phenomena, we confront the notion that Being itself is a shared foundation. The question arises: Where does Being go when an individual is no longer present in our observable world?

The answer lies in recognizing that Being persists; it is not confined to individual manifestations but is the underlying reality enabling all existence. Therefore, the self, the other, and the phenomena are all expressions of Being.

Conclusion

Through this analytical exploration of the circles of focus, we demonstrate that the self is both the experiencer and, fundamentally, connected to the experienced world. The self navigates between recognizing its distinctness from phenomena and acknowledging its inherent connection to the conditions that make existence possible. This duality reflects the core of the transliminal being's existence, embodying the interplay of belonging and alienation that constitutes change and informs our understanding of temporality.

19.6. The Self as Both Experiencer and Experienced

This reflection illustrates why I claim and assert that the self is both the personal ownmost being of the transliminal being (the human being) and simultaneously the phenomenal world of the transliminal being.

Evidencing the Self as Both Personal Ownmost Being and Phenomenal World

To substantiate the claim that the self is both the personal ownmost being of the transliminal being (human being) and simultaneously the phenomenal world of the transliminal being, we systematically analyze the existential structures of human existence, drawing on Heideggerian concepts.

Concernful Engagement

The human being is characterized by a fundamental mode of concerned engagement with its own being. This means we are inherently involved in caring about and attending to our existence, constantly seeking meaning and purpose.

Being-in-the-World

This concerned engagement is always situated within the context of Being-in-the-World (*In-der-Welt-sein*). Our existence is not isolated but intrinsically linked to the world we inhabit. We cannot conceive of ourselves apart from the contexts and environments that shape our experiences.

Engagement Through Phenomena

Being-in-the-World brings us into engagement with our own being through phenomena—the ways in which things appear to us. These phenomena call forth our potential to engage with our being:

Ontico-ontological Engagement: We engage with both specific entities (ontic) encountered in the world and with Being itself (ontological), which is the ground of all beings.

We utilize phenomenological approaches (direct experiential engagement) and hermeneutical methods (interpretation of meaning) to understand our existence.

Being as Disclosure

Being itself enables the disclosure of phenomena. Rather than merely making phenomena possible, Being actively reveals or discloses them to us. This disclosure is the process by which things become accessible to our understanding and experience.

Engagement with Being

Through the disclosure of phenomena, we engage with Being in its ontico-ontological character:

Phenomenologically: Experiencing phenomena directly as they present themselves.

Hermeneutically: Interpreting and making sense of these experiences within our historical and linguistic contexts.

Factically: Recognizing the factual conditions and circumstances of our existence.

Being allows us to engage concernfully with our own being, emphasizing that our understanding is always interpretive and shaped by our prior experiences and language.

Mineness (Jemeinigkeit)

Our engagement is fundamentally characterized by mineness—a sense of personal ownership and uniqueness in our existence. We are each the being who engages with our own being concernfully through Being's disclosure, experiencing life from our individual perspectives.

Existential Existence

Because our engagement is characterized by mineness, we exist in an existential sense. Our existence is not just a state of being but an active process of engaging with and understanding our being. We are the only beings whose being is existential in that we are aware of and can reflect upon our existence.

Existence as Mine

Our existential engagement means that existence is mine—it is personal and individual. We do not just exist; we own our existence through our engagement with it, making choices and assigning meaning based on our experiences.

Engagement with Self

Being discloses entities to us existentially, and our primary engagement is with ourselves. Our primordial engagement is an interaction with our own being, approached phenomenologically and hermeneutically within our factual existence in the world. We continually interpret and reinterpret our experiences to understand ourselves.

Existence Through the Self

Our existence is an existing in and through the Self. Since we are existence, and existence is characterized by mineness, our engagement in existence is fundamentally an engagement with the Self. Our self-understanding is intertwined with our understanding of the world.

Integration of Self and World

This analysis demonstrates that the self is both the personal ownmost being and simultaneously connected to the phenomenal world:

As the ownmost being, we possess a unique, individual existence characterized by mineness and personal engagement.

As part of the phenomenal world, our existence and understanding are shaped by the disclosure of Being through phenomena. The world we engage with is not separate from us but is integral to our self-understanding.

Our engagement with the world is both a reflection of ourselves and an interaction with that which is beyond us. The transliminal being exists at the threshold between self and world, embodying both. This duality evidences that the self cannot be fully understood without considering its relationship with the phenomenal world, and vice versa.

19.7. The Paradox as Evidence for the Framework

Returning to the question:

Does the experiential basis of this paradox serve as evidence to justify my exceedingly abstract framework of the being of the human as both the *experiencer* and simultaneously the *non-self phenomena* and *world experienced*?

I believe it does. The paradoxical nature of temporality, as both unchanging and ever-changing, reflects the dual nature of the transliminal being. The human being experiences time both as an unchanging presence (the ownmost self) and as a series of changes (the phenomenal world). This duality is evidenced in our lived experiences and is foundational to understanding the being of the human.

19.8. Further Clarification on "Alienation"

To prevent any confusion about my use of "alienation," let me emphasize that I do not refer to *feelings* of alienation.

When I use this term, I mean that I, as the human being in first-person experiential engagement, never perceive myself as, for example, my car, the interior of my car, the seat of my car, or the steering wheel. There is a vast, open-ended aspect to the being of the transliminal being that never grasps itself as being what it engages with and experiences.

This extends even into our own selves when we treat things like our thoughts as not who we are. We might say:

"I am not defined by my thinking. What I think arises of its own accord, and I am in control to decide what I feel is correct and question those thoughts which present themselves questionably and unstably, perhaps even dangerously to my well-being."

Similarly, we might treat parts of our body as not who we are, agreeing on statements like:

"I can still live without my leg."

Meaning that what we are is not the organic matter we call our body.

When I say "alienate," I refer to the special and peculiar way in which the transliminal being treats an entire "world" as completely different and altogether not itself—distinct and apart from itself.

19.9. The Paradox of Belonging and Alienation Constitutes Change

What I am trying to show, derived in part from the works of Heidegger and Kant, is that the existentiality of the transliminal being includes the quintessential structure of Alienation—that the "world" of its being and all the "phenomena" of its being are not it at all, when, as it turns out, the being of the transliminal being is, in fact, the being of the whole world and all the beings and phenomena that contextually and situationally constitute the world and the things within it.

This is further revealed by the way in which the transliminal being can find itself to be "part of the fabric of the universe," "interconnected with all things," "made of the same particles as all other things," fundamentally the same material and matter as

everything that exists—a framework of thought that I aim to clarify through the concept of "being-as."

The being-as of the transliminal being demonstrates this very structure of being both the experiencer (the place of belonging where I am always to be) and the experienced (the alienated other to me, inconstant and constantly expressing itself through an alienating differentiation to keep me from seeing myself as it, being the place where I am always already belonging).

Drawing from this, one of my central conclusions is that this paradoxical relationship between Belonging and Alienation constitutes Change itself and is an existential structure (*existentiale*) of the being of the transliminal being.

As such, the successive moments of past, present, and future phasing over and into one another in the construct of linear temporality is how the existentials of Belonging and Alienation articulate themselves through the expression of Change.